

makes advance planning difficult and, possibly, unwise. It could create rigidities in responses where flexibility is needed.

In the 1960s, many of us had a clear—and correct—view of the big forces at work. We moved straight ahead to meet the challenges, but with blinders on. We too often ignored the pathologies of the institutions we were building. Few of us foresaw the rise of the student rebellion, and when it came we treated it too often as an interference with the urgent pursuit of our visions.

Academic leaders now may not be able to identify any great visions to guide them nor great and compatible forces to dominate them. They may need to look in more directions, to be sensitive to many diverse opportunities and to many threats. They will be more concerned with survival than with great visions, survival for themselves and for their institutions.

The Need for Strengthened Governance

Not all segments of higher education will face the full range of challenges, but all will face serious and continuing conflicts over resources, exacerbating tensions on campus and between campuses and the larger society. To meet these conflicts, higher education will need to find ways to strengthen the capacity for effective action on the part of three key sets of actors involved in governance: boards of trustees, presidents, and faculties.

Many of the new and intensified problems will come to rest particularly on the trustees' shoulders. These include (1) ensuring that cooperation with industry does not intrude on the basic science activities and the integrity of research universities, (2) developing admissions and tuition policies to serve the vastly expanded numbers of potential students, (3) improving the performance of schools of education in training teachers and in recommending educational policies for primary and secondary education, (4) finding sufficient resources and monitoring their efficient use, and (5) selecting and supporting able presidents. In light of these increasing demands, the time has come to strengthen boards of trustees, through longer terms and more sources of appointment for trustees of public institutions, thus lessening gubernatorial control.

Shock Wave II will require presidents to make more and harder decisions while, at the same time, they face a more formidable array of external interests and internal critics. Changes will be necessary to enhance these presidential positions, such as lengthening terms and providing sufficient rewards to compensate for the efforts involved.

Faculty governance is the third stress point. It is now too often centered on internal issues and moves too slowly. I suggest that faculty senates elect executive committees to exercise ongoing total institutional oversight and to act quickly in an emergency. I also suggest estab-

lishing faculty external affairs committees to consider academic relations with government and industry.

External guidelines could also improve faculty participation in governance. The American Association of University Professors, for example, might work on a new code of trustee and faculty ethics, one perhaps more oriented to external concerns, in particular on how to protect the university's function as an independent critic of society as it becomes more enmeshed in that society.

To meet these conflicts, higher education will need to find ways to strengthen the capacity for effective action on the part of three key sets of actors involved in governance: boards of trustees, presidents, and faculties.

Missions Threatened

The new era threatens some long-standing purposes of the university in American society. In 1973, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education identified five purposes that historically have been served by higher education. They included providing opportunities for individual student development, the advancement of human capability in society at large, enlargement of educational justice, the transmission and advancement of learning and wisdom, and the critical evaluation of society for the sake of society's self-renewal. It is the last of these that may be most threatened in the new era as outside entities, especially industry, attempt to encourage diversion of university resources to projects that have a prospective payoff and could provide, through patents, capture of the ownership of the new knowledge. A new code of academic ethics should include control of selection of scholarly endeavors by scholars alone. ■

International Providers of Higher Education in India

K. B. Powar and Veena Bhalla

K. B. Powar is secretary general of the Association of Indian Universities, New Delhi. Veena Bhalla is under secretary of the Student Information Services, in the Association of Indian Universities. Address: Association of Indian Universities, AIU House, 16, Kotla Marg, New Delhi 110 002, India. E-Mail: <aiu@del2.vsnl.net.in>.

With higher education having become an international business, foreign academic institutions of different types are advertising their programs in Indian newspapers, magazines, and journals. The advertise-

Special Focus: International Mobility and Multinational Trends

ments are aimed at attracting students to academic institutions abroad or inducing them to register for diploma and degree programs of foreign universities that are offered in India itself. A survey of advertisements that appeared in 14 national newspapers, between July and December 2000, provides information on the nature of the programs, the background and distribution of the universities and institutions offering them, and the academic standing of the Indian partners.

An Overview

A perusal of these advertisements showed that the largest number of advertisers (who total 144) are from the United Kingdom (53) followed by Australia (40), the United States (24), Canada (7), and New Zealand. Other countries advertising are Bulgaria (2), Cyprus (1), France (2), Hong Kong (China) (1), Ireland (1), Mauritius (1), Nepal (2), Romania (1), Russia (1) and Switzerland (3). While 117 of the institutions are seeking to attract students to their countries, the remaining 27 are offering programs in India. Furthermore, as many as 46 foreign providers are not recognized or accredited in their own countries. Besides, 23 of the 26 Indian partners are not affiliated with any Indian university—an indication that they have entered the academic arena primarily for commercial gain.

The foreign universities offer a variety of undergraduate and postgraduate courses in practically all faculties. Students are invited to enroll, on the home-campus, in undergraduate courses in the liberal arts, business, and medicine. Also on offer are postgraduate courses in engineering, technology, the sciences, the social sciences, law, arts and design, business administration, international business, banking, finance, and management. One of the institutions is offering direct web-based learning.

The programs offered in India are predominantly those in the professional areas of management and engineering. The management courses that lead to an MBA are in the specialized areas of marketing, finance, information systems, mass communications, and international affairs. Other postgraduate management programs are in hotel management, healthcare, and tourism. Engineering undergraduate programs are available in textile engineering, computer engineering, information technology, and communications technology. There are also postgraduate programs in computer science, computer and communications technology, and information technology. Also on offer are undergraduate programs in arts, business, management, and law.

Implications and Options

In his spring 1999 article in this newsletter, "The Perils of Internationalizing Higher Education: An Asian Per-

spective," Philip Altbach characterized the current wave influenced by the profit motive rather than by government policy. Increasingly sophisticated marketing techniques are being used to meet demands and create niches for "educational products." The article notes that universities from the developed countries are offering "off-shore degrees," in collaboration with noneducational institutions; that the Internet is being used to deliver degrees; that there are few controls concerning quality; and that programs are being offered not only by respected institutions but also by low-prestige schools simply selling worthless certificates.

The foreign universities offer a variety of undergraduate and postgraduate courses in practically all faculties.

Our survey supports Altbach's conclusions and concerns. In India, internationalization of higher education has taken a commercial form, with academic considerations often taking a backseat. In principle, no objection can be raised against foreign universities trying to recruit students for study outside India. In a way foreign study meets the need for a quality education among students who are unable to gain admission to the best institutions in India but have the desire and the means to study abroad. The objection is against the "selling" of degrees, of questionable standard, by nonrecognized institutions and even by some recognized universities. The franchising of programs has become common. Little or no supervision is exercised by faculty from the parent institution, facilities are often minimal, and there are few controls relating to quality or financial arrangements.

From the Indian point of view, the activities of such institutions clearly need to be controlled. Unfortunately, the relevant laws are ambiguous on this point. The 1956 University Grants Commission Act or the 1987 All India Council for Technical Education, for example, do not prohibit the operation of foreign institutions in India, nor do they have provisions concerning the functioning of these institutions in India. The laws relating to foreign exchange do place some restrictions in this area, but these are being increasingly diluted. These factors allow foreign institutions a great deal of latitude; for all practical purposes, they can act with few restrictions. There is, therefore, a clear need to finalize and adopt a policy relating to the operation of foreign institutions in India. To stop the gross commercialization of education, the operation of the Indian partners must be regulated, with only genuine academic institutions being allowed to participate in "twinning activities." Franchising has

been possible only because the legal milieu does not prohibit or regulate it.

To promote quality education, it would be worthwhile to create genuine institutional links that are based on equal participation and have adequate controls related to quality and financial arrangements. As a step in this direction, the Association of Indian Universities (AIU), in 1999, formulated guidelines covering the grant of equivalence to degrees offered in India by foreign universities. The main conditions laid down are, first, that the Indian institution (partner) has adequate infrastructure and facilities as substantiated by the report of a Review Committee of the AIU; second, that the program is implemented jointly by the foreign and the Indian universities, or academic institutions affiliated to them, with both contributing to the academic program in approximately equal measure; and third, that the

foreign university gives an undertaking, in the form of a certificate, that the degree or diploma awarded to the student in India would be considered as equivalent to the corresponding degree or diploma awarded by the home university, and that it would be recognized in that country as being equivalent to the corresponding degree or diploma of the awarding university.

To date, only one university has applied for the grant of equivalence. Obviously, the guidelines of the AIU are not acceptable to the foreign providers of higher education. Perhaps they feel that they can continue operation without a grant of equivalence, for there is no dearth of students wanting a foreign degree. One can understand higher education having financial aspects, but most people in India believe that it must essentially be grounded in academic values.

American Accrediting and the International Environment

Judith S. Eaton

Judith S. Eaton is president of the Council for Higher Education Accreditation. Address: CHEA, 1 Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036. E-mail: <eaton@chea.org>

The Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) is an umbrella organization for the regional and professional accrediting agencies in the United States. A 1999 CHEA survey of participating accrediting organizations showed that 34 of the 55 CHEA regional, national, and specialized accreditors were engaged in international activity. Together, these organizations are accrediting 355 institutions or programs in 65 countries. Fifteen of these CHEA accreditors have separate standards or guidelines for reviewing institutions and programs abroad.

The findings in the CHEA survey as well as anecdotal information from various U.S. accreditors confirm that there is keen interest in expanding this quality review activity around the world. At the same time, the U.S. federal government is promoting international higher education and calling for more study abroad programs, student exchanges, and foreign-language study.

Interest in U.S. Accreditation Systems

Institutions and agencies in other countries are actively seeking more information about how U.S. accreditation works. In the last year alone, the CHEA assisted many international visitors with a particular interest in higher education accreditation and quality assurance. Other higher education associations, U.S. colleges and universities, and the U.S. federal

government host hundreds of international visitors as well.

The interest of U.S. accreditors in expanded international activity and the attention that the international community is giving to U.S. accreditation standards is fueled by the expanding international mobility of students and the rapidly growing world of on-line education offered by distance-learning providers. Other factors are also involved—the need for skilled workers in an information- and service-driven international economy and the international consensus that higher education is central to the success of all economies and global well-being.

Yet, this is a difficult international, regional, and domestic environment in which to pursue the invigorated mutual interest in international quality review. When U.S. accreditors go abroad, they receive mixed reviews. Critics in some countries routinely ask whether the otherwise laudable U.S. commitment to access and participation is too flexible in its expectations concerning institutional quality. Others point to the responsibilities that accompany the dominant U.S. role in the import and export of higher education, urging the United States to do more to protect students in other countries and to improve communication and cooperation with the international community.

Regional Trends

Regionally, Europe is taking on the challenge of creating a “European higher education space” and exploring the feasibility of European accreditation of institutions and organizations. This would place a “European” stamp on